EXHIBIT "A"

Cess 2:29 6-4-0-10163-7-10 MR DEGLEMENT 1. Filed 02/29/20 Page 2 of 12

GARIBIAN LAW OFFICES, P.C.

Antranig N. Garibian, Esq., PA Attorney ID No. 94538*

1800 John F. Kennedy Boulevard, Suite 300

Philadelphia, PA 19103 Telephone: (215) 326-9179

ag@garibianlaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff, ASAM, LLC

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

ASAM, LLC.

V.

16

0687

Plaintiff.

CIVIL ACTION NO.

COMPLAINT

WAKSARD CAPITAL, LLC, JESSE SHEMESH,

Defendants.

Plaintiff, ASAM, LLC, by and through counsel, Garibian Law Offices, P.C., by way of Complaint against defendants, Waksard Capital, LLC and Jesse Shemesh (collectively, "Defendants"), avers as follows:

PARTIES

- 1. Plaintiff, ASAM, LLC ("ASAM") is a limited liability company organized and incorporated pursuant to the laws of the Commonwealth of Virginia, with its principal place of business at 1401 N. Rhodes Street, #505, Arlington, VA 22209.
- 2. Defendant, Waksard Capital, LLC ("Waksard") is a limited liability company organized and incorporated pursuant to the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, with its principal place of business at 230 S. Broad St., 17th Floor, Philadelphia, PA 19102.
- 3. Defendant, Jesse Shemesh ("Shemesh"), is an adult citizen of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 4. This Court has original subject matter jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332 because the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000.00 exclusive of interests and costs and is between citizens of different states.
 - 5. Plaintiff, ASAM, is a citizen of Virginia.
 - 6. Defendant, Waksard, is a citizen of Pennsylvania.
 - 7. Defendant, Shemesh, is a citizen of Pennsylvania.
- 8. Venue in this district is proper pursuant to 1391(b)(1) because all of the defendants are residents of Pennsylvania.
- 9. Venue in this district is also proper pursuant to 1391(b)(2) because a substantial part of the events or admissions giving rise to this action occurred within the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

NATURE OF THE CLAIM

10. In this action, ASAM asserts claims of breach of contract, breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing, unjust enrichment and resulting trust, fraud in the inducement, negligent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duties, demand for accounting and conversion arising out of Defendants' misconduct as ASAM's real estate investment partner.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Projects

11. In approximately 2013, Defendants planned to begin constructing and developing residential and commercial real estate throughout Philadelphia, PA.

- 12. Defendants induced ASAM to participate with Waksard in several joint ventures, which were to be formed as limited partnerships, in order to develop and sell residential real estate throughout Philadelphia, PA.
- 13. In these joint ventures, Waksard was general partner and ASAM was the limited partner.
- 14. Shemesh, as a managing member of Waksard, served as Waksard's chief representative to ASAM and coordinated the construction activities and management of the finances of the limited partnerships.
- 15. On February 13, 2013, Waksard and ASAM formed Waksard Partners III, LP to develop the properties located at 2261 N. Park Ave., Philadelphia, PA 19132 and 2311 N. Park Ave., Philadelphia, PA 19132. Waksard was the general partner and ASAM was the Limited Partner.
- 16. On July 17, 2013, Waksard and ASAM formed Waksard Partners V, LP to develop the property located at 612 N 2nd St. Philadelphia, PA 19123. Waksard was the general partner and ASAM was the Limited Partner.
- 17. On July 17, 2013, Waksard and ASAM formed 1326 N. Mascher St. Partners, LP to develop the property located at 1326 N. Mascher St., Philadelphia, PA 19122. Waksard was the general partner and ASAM was the Limited Partner.
- 18. The projects contemplated by the formation of Waksard Partners III, LP, Waksard Partners, V, LP and 1326 N. Mascher St. Partners, LP are collectively referred to herein as the "Projects."

- 19. In each of the Projects, the relationship between ASAM and Waksard were governed by a partnership agreement (referenced collectively herein as the "Partnership Agreements").
- 20. Waksard withdrew as General Partner of each of the Projects on December 31, 2015.

Defendants' Misconduct

- 21. Defendants represented and furnished information to convince ASAM that Waksard and Shemesh had the experience and expertise to acquire and develop the real estate into profitable real estate ventures.
- 22. Defendants promised ASAM that ASAM would receive a 30% internal rate of return on its investment in the Projects. Defendants further promised ASAM that ASAM would receive an early return of the capital through a refinance on two of the Projects.
- 23. Upon information and belief, it is averred that Defendants' plan *ab initio* was to induce ASAM to contribute funds as a limited partner, so that Defendants could misappropriate and use the funds for their own personal gain, rather than for the development of the Projects.
- 24. In reality, Defendants' mismanagement and undercapitalization of the Projects resulted in the Projects failing.
- 25. Defendants did not pay the subcontractors who were hired to perform work on the Projects.
 - 26. Defendants did not adequately supervise or manage the Projects.
- 27. Defendant Shemesh wrongfully solicited and accepted bribes and "kickbacks" from contractors hired to work on the Projects persuade him to hire them for work on the Projects.

- 28. Defendants continuously asked ASAM to invest additional money while at the same time intentionally making false and misleading representations as to why additional contributions were needed.
- 29. Upon information and belief, Defendants were using ASAM's money to pay off creditors and investors on other projects in which ASAM was not involved.
- 30. Specifically, Defendants took money from the Projects to pay for deposits, extension fees, legal fees, and architectural fees for Projects having no connection at all to ASAM.
- 31. Specifically, Defendants made direct withdrawals from the bank accounts associated with the Projects and transferred those funds to their own personal accounts.

Count I

Breach of Contract

- 32. ASAM re-alleges all of the foregoing paragraphs as it fully set forth herein.
- 33. The Partnership Agreements were binding contracts under which Defendants owed duties to ASAM.
- 34. Defendants' aforementioned wrongful conduct constituted a breach of the Partnership Agreements.
- 35. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' wrongful conduct, ASAM has and continues to incur substantial damages, including extra business expense, debt, lost business opportunities, lost profits, attorneys' fees and costs.

WHEREFORE, ASAM demands judgment in its favor and against Defendants, jointly, severally, and/or individually for compensatory and other damages, in the amount of \$1,000,000.00, a sum certain, and such other relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

Count II

Breach of the Implied Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing

- 36. ASAM re-alleges all of the foregoing paragraphs as it fully set forth herein.
- 37. Defendants owed ASAM an implied duty of good faith and fair dealing with regard to their conduct under the Partnership Agreements.
- 38. Defendants were bound by their promises to ASAM under the Partnership Agreements.
- 39. Despite that knowledge, Defendants knowingly and blatantly disregarded their obligations to ASAM under the Partnership Agreements.
- 40. Defendants breached their duty to act in good faith with respect to their contractual duties to ASAM under the Partnership Agreements.
- 41. Defendants acted unreasonably and in bad faith and deprived ASAM of the benefit of the bargain by refusing to perform their obligations to ASAM under the Partnership Agreements.
- 42. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' wrongful conduct, ASAM has and continues to incur substantial damages, including extra business expense, debt, lost business opportunities, lost profits, attorneys' fees and costs.

WHEREFORE, ASAM demands judgment in its favor and against Defendants, jointly, severally, and/or individually for compensatory and other damages, in the amount of \$1,000,000.00, a sum certain, and such other relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

Count III

Unjust Enrichment (in the alternative) and Resulting Trust

- 43. ASAM re-alleges all of the foregoing paragraphs as it fully set forth herein.
- 44. ASAM conferred a benefit upon Defendants by contributing capital to the Projects.

- 45. As a result of the conduct described herein, Defendants were unjustly enriched at the expense and to the detriment of ASAM.
- 46. By reason of Defendants' conduct, Defendants were unjustly enriched and all monies and assets acquired by them in connection with the Projects are trust funds, creating a "resulting trust" for the benefit of Plaintiff.
- 47. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' wrongful conduct, ASAM has and continues to incur substantial damages, including extra business expense, debt, lost business opportunities, lost profits, attorneys' fees and costs.
- 48. It would be inequitable to allow Defendants to enjoy the benefit of ASAM's funds without repayment.
- 49. Accordingly, Defendants should be required to make payment to ASAM to prevent Defendants from being unjustly enriched.

Count IV

Fraud In the Inducement

- 50. ASAM re-alleges all of the foregoing paragraphs as it fully set forth herein.
- 51. Defendants consistently represented to ASAM that they had the necessary funding to complete the Projects and that the Projects were adequately capitalized.
- 52. Defendants engaged in a fraudulent and deceptive scheme to lure and mislead ASAM into investing money into the Projects in order to improperly convert the money, rather than utilize it for the development and completion of the Projects.

- 53. Defendants knew at the time they made the false representations and concealed the true financial condition of the Projects that such representations were untrue and that Defendants were concealing material facts from ASAM regarding the viability of the Projects.
- 54. Defendants acted with the intention to deceive and mislead ASAM and to fraudulently induce ASAM into investing and contributing funds to the Projects.
- 55. ASAM acted in reasonable reliance upon Defendants' false representations and material omissions and was thereby induced to continue to invest in the Projects.
- 56. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' wrongful conduct, ASAM has and continues to incur substantial damages, including extra business expense, debt, lost business opportunities, lost profits, attorneys' fees and costs.

Count V

Negligent Misrepresentation

- 57. ASAM re-alleges all of the foregoing paragraphs as it fully set forth herein.
- 58. Although Plaintiff avers that Defendants acted intentionally in all respects, if the false statements or omissions set forth above were not made with knowledge or recklessness as to their falsity, then they were made negligently, or without due care, by Defendants.
- 59. Defendants supplied the information to ASAM regarding the Projects in the course of their business and failed to exercise due care and competence in obtaining and communicating the information, which ASAM was reasonably justified in expecting.

- 60. Defendants knew that ASAM would reasonably rely on Defendants' representations, and Defendants intended to influence and induce action on the part of ASAM through those representations.
- 61. ASAM was, in fact, deceived by Defendants' misrepresentations and omissions and reasonably and justifiably relied to its detriment on those misrepresentations and omissions.
- 62. Defendants' misrepresentations and/or omissions regarding the Projects were false and misleading at the time they were made.
- 63. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' misrepresentations and omissions, ASAM continued to contribute funds to the Projects and was damaged. ASAM would have never continued to invest money into the Projects if ASAM had not been provided with the aforementioned false information regarding the Projects.
- 64. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' wrongful conduct, ASAM has and continues to incur substantial damages, including extra business expense, debt, lost business opportunities, lost profits, attorneys' fees and costs.

Count VI

Breach of Fiduciary Duties

- 65. ASAM re-alleges all of the foregoing paragraphs as it fully set forth herein.
- 66. In its capacity as a general partner in the Projects, Waksard owed a fiduciary duty to ASAM to act with the utmost good faith, honesty and loyalty, and not to favor its own interests at the expense of ASAM.

- 67. In his capacity as a member of Waksard, there was a relationship of dependence and influence between Shemesh and ASAM. Accordingly, Shemesh owed a fiduciary duty to ASAM to act with the utmost good faith, honesty and loyalty, and not to favor his own interests at the expense of ASAM.
- 68. By the foregoing conduct, Defendants willingly and fraudulently breached their fiduciary duties to ASAM by making material misrepresentations and omissions and by failing to disclose material facts regarding the status of the Projects and by placing their own interests ahead of the interests of ASAM.
- 69. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' wrongful conduct, ASAM has and continues to incur substantial damages, including extra business expense, debt, lost business opportunities, lost profits, attorneys' fees and costs.

Count VII

Demand for Accounting

- 70. ASAM re-alleges all of the foregoing paragraphs as it fully set forth herein.
- 71. Plaintiff demands an accounting to explain precisely how Defendants misappropriated and disbursed the funds contributed by Plaintiff to Defendants for the Project.

WHEREFORE, ASAM demands from all Defendants a full and complete accounting of all funds advanced by ASAM to Defendants for use in the Projects.

Count VIII

Conversion

72. ASAM re-alleges all of the foregoing paragraphs as it fully set forth herein.

Case 2:20-cv-01217-CMR Document 2-1 Filed 03/06/20 Page 12 of 15 Case 2:16-cv-00687-CMR Document 1 Filed 02/11/16 Page 11 of 14

Defendants wrongfully took and misappropriated the funds contributed by ASAM 73.

that were contributed for the use and development of the Projects.

74. Despite demands, Defendants have failed to return the converted property to

Plaintiff.

As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' wrongful conduct, ASAM has and 75.

continues to incur substantial damages, including extra business expense, debt, lost business

opportunities, lost profits, attorneys' fees and costs.

WHEREFORE, ASAM demands judgment in its favor and against Defendants, jointly,

severally, and/or individually for compensatory and other damages, in the amount of

\$1,000,000.00 and such other relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

GARIBIAN LAW OFFICES, P.C.

Antranig N. Garibián, Esquire PA Attorney ID No. 94538

1800 John F. Kennedy Boulevard, Suite 300

Philadelphia, PA 19103

Telephone: (215) 326-9179

ag@garibianlaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff, ASAM, LLC

0687

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA - DESIGNATION FORM to be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of essignment to appropriate calendar. 1401 N. Rhodes St. # 505 Arlington, VA 22209 Address of Plaintiff: 230 S. Broad St., 17th Floor PA 19102; Jesse Shemesh: 802 Mystles Way Philadeldia. Perkarie, PA 189 Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: (Use Reverse Side For Additional Space) Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation and any publicly held corporation ownig of its stock? No (Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a)) No Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities? RELATED CASE, IF ANY: Date Terminated: Case Number: Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions: 1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? 2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? No Yes 🗆 3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? 4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights case filed by the same individual? Yes CIVIL: (Place / in one category only) Diversity Jurisdiction Cases: A. Federal Question Cases: 1. D Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts Insurance Contract and Other Contracts ☐ Airplane Personal Injury 2. D FELA ssault, Defamation 3. Dones Act-Personal Injury Marine Personal Injury 4.

Antitrust 5. D Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 5. D Patent 6. D Other Personal Injury (Please specify) 6. □ Labor-Management Relations 7. Products Liability 7. Civil Rights 8. D Products Liability - Asbestos 8. D Habeas Corpus 9. □ All other Diversity Cases 9. D Securities Act(s) Cases 10. □ Social Security Review Cases (Please specify) 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify) ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check Appropriate Category) counsel of record do hereby certify: Pursuant to Local Girll Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of 50,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs; Relief other than monetary damages is sought. NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38. I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court except as noted above. 94538 2-12-12 DATE: Attorney I.D.#



IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

ASAM, LLC	:	: CIVIL ACTION	
Waksard Capita Jesse Shemesh	el, LLC and	$_{NO}$. 16	068'
In accordance with the Civi plaintiff shall complete a Ca filing the complaint and serv side of this form.) In the designation, that defendant the plaintiff and all other parts.	I Justice Expense and Delay Reduse Management Track Designation e a copy on all defendants. (See § 1 event that a defendant does not against with its first appearance, subrties, a Case Management Track Deves the case should be assigned.	n Form in all civil cases at the :03 of the plan set forth on the gree with the plaintiff regar- mit to the clerk of court and	ne time of ne reverse ding said serve on
SELECT ONE OF THE F	OLLOWING CASE MANAGEM	IENT TRACKS:	
(a) Habeas Corpus – Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255.			()
	requesting review of a decision of a ying plaintiff Social Security Ben		()
(c) Arbitration - Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2			5.2. ()
(d) Asbestos – Cases involv exposure to asbestos.	ing claims for personal injury or p	roperty damage from	()
commonly referred to as	Cases that do not fall into tracks (as complex and that need special or side of this form for a detailed exp	intense management by	60
(f) Standard Management -	Cases that do not fall into any one	e of the other tracks.	(*)
2/(2/16 Date	Antrania Garibian, Esq. Attorney-at-law	Plaintiff ASAM, I	_عد
215-326-9179	267-238-3801	ag@ganibianlau	, COM
Telephone	FAX Number	E-Mail Address	

(Civ. 660) 10/02